Application No. 10/684045 Amendment dated May 2, 2006 Reply to Office Action of Pehnany 10, 2006

Docket No.: 013227.0101C1US (Formedy 13227.101C1 (.202))

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed 10 February 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 4 — 30 on the ground of non-statutory double patenting over claims 1 — 30 of US Patent No. 6,671,696 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent. A Terminal Disclaimer is attached to this response.

In the Office Action mailed 10 February 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 21, and 22 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Loen (US Patent No. 6,438,560 B1). The Examiner also objected to claims 3 - 10, 13 - 20, and 23 - 30 as "being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and overcoming the current double patenting rejection." Claims 3-10, 13-20, and 23-30 have been amended to overcome this objection by writing the limitations of claims 3, 13, and 23 into independent base claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively, and then canceling claims 3, 13, and 23. In addition, Applicants have amended claims 4, 14, and 24 to include the limitations of their corresponding base claims 1, 11, and 21, thereby rewriting these dependent claims in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance. Applicants believe no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1848, under Order No. 013227.0101C1US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

> Respectfully submitted, PATTON BOGGS LLP

2006 מו MAY

James M. Graziano

Registration No.: 28,300 (303) 830-1776

(303) 894-9239 (Fax)

Customer No. 24283

Attorney for Applicants

Dans 10 af 10